V-231M99
M99
(B)4581

(a) Renewal of Arms Licenses and the License fee.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) Arms licenses need not be renewed every year but may be contianed until withdrawn or cancelled.

Mr. Narainswami Setty of Chikballapur represented that the licenses may be renewed once in five years

Mr. Syed Saheb of Kankanhalli proposed that the annual license system may be abolished and the license fee levied like mohatarfa.

Mr. Srinivasaiya of T. Narsipur deprecated the provision for the renewal of licenses annually and the prohibition against carrying arms by rail.

Reply of Government.—The Government are not prepared to grant any of these requests.

Subject No. 43.
Investing Revenue Inspectors with Civil and Magisterial powers.

Summary of discussion.—Revenue Inspectors (*i. e.* Sheikdars) may be invested with power to dispose of civil suits up to Rs. 20 and petty criminal cases within their range, in the same manner as village Magistrates in British Territory.

Reply of Government—Not practicable.

Subject No. 44.
(a) Relieving Amildars of Magisterial work.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) The Amildars may be relieved of Magisterial work and a special officer appointed to look after Civil, Criminal and Registration Departments.

Reply of Government.—*Vide* reply to Subject No. 40 above.

(b) Relieving Amildars of Police Work.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) Amildars may be relieved of Police duties, as failure of justice may result if the cases investigated by them are also disposed of by them as Magistrates.

Mr. Guru Row of Nanjangud in this connection solicited attention to the reply given during the discussions of 1897.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Subject No. 45.
Separation of Judicial from Executive functions.

Summary of discussion.—Provision may be made for the separation of Judicial from Executive functions.

Mr. M. Venkatakrishnaiya of the Mysore City Municipality submitted a written representation on the subject.

Mr. Sivappa of Sorab Taluk said that it would not do to invest with Magisterial powers any officer in receipt of a smaller salary than Rs. 100.

Mr. Srinivasa Rao of the Chikmagalur Taluk requested that the provision may at least be made in some Taluks as a tentative measure.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Subject No. 46.
Appeals to Deputy Commissioners.

Summary of discussion.—Appeals against the orders of Amildars may not be disposed of by Deputy Commissioners without giving the parties an opportunity of pleading their case. Legal Practitioners should be heard in Revenue Cases.

Other Representatives, however, opposed this proposal on the ground of the great cost to parties and were in favor of the existing practice.

Reply of Government.—The present rules and practice are sufficient for all purposes.

Subject No. 47.
Allowing Advocates and Pleaders to appear on behalf of appellants before Councillors.

Summary of discussion.—Parties appealing against the decisions of the District Revenue Officers may be allowed to engage counsel to represent them before the Councillors.

Reply of Government.—The present rules cannot be altered.

Subject No. 48.
Local Pleaders not to practice more than five years in each Court.

Summary of discussion.—Pleaders practising in the Munsiff's Courts adhere to one and the same place. In the interests of public justice, it would be well to limit their term of practice in a single Court to five years, and also to restrict their practice to the age of 55 years as in the case of the service of public servants.

Note.—This proposal was received by the rest of the Representatives with disapproval.

Reply of Government.—This cannot be done.

Subject No. 49.
Supply of breech-loaders to important Police Stations.

Summary of discussion.—Breech-loaders may be ordered to be supplied to important Police Stations or to the Taluk Kasba Police Stations.

Reply of Government.—This is engaging the attention of Government.

Subject No. 50.
Appeals against Sub-Registrars in the Taluks of Sub-Divisions.

Summary of discussion.—Sub-Division Officers may be empowered to hear appeals against Sub-Registrars in the Taluks of their Sub-Divisions and also to supervise their work.

Reply of Government.—Referred to the Inspector General of Registration for opinion.

Subject No. 51.
Reduction of fees for visits of Registration Officers for registry of documents in private houses.

Summary of discussion.—The Registration fee of Rs. 10 payable to the Sub-Registrar for attendance in private houses for registration of documents may be reduced to Rs. 5, as also other Registration charges.

Reply of Government.—A reduction of the fee is not considered desirable.

Subject No. 52.
Presentation by Advocates and Pleaders of Court decrees for registration without a further power of attorney.

Summary of discussion.—Advocates and Pleaders obtaining Civil Court decrees on Vakalats executed by their clients in their favor may be permitted to present such decrees for registration without further Vakalats.

Reply of Government.—The Registration Act requires a power of attorney in such cases. The requirements of the law must be complied with.

Subject No. 53.
Appointment of prosecuting Inspectors in Districts and Sub-Divisions.

Summary of discussion.—Prosecuting Inspectors may be appointed in all Districts and Sub-Divisions for conducting Criminal and important Civil cases on behalf of Government.

Reply of Government.—Under consideration.

Subject No. 54.
Deputation of Sub-Registrars to look after Sanitary Works.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars have heavy work while Sub-Registrars have light work. The latter may therefore be deputed to attend to the sanitation of towns